DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 237 CS 202 124

AUTHOR	Berdan, Robert
TITLE	Have/Got in the Speech of Children.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SWRL-TN-2-72-57
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Language; Dialect Studies; *Educational Research; Elementary Education; English; Ethnic Groups; Grammar; *Language Usage; *Nonstandard Dialects; *Oral Communication; Speech; Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

The syntactic and semantic constraints on the occurrence of HAVE-GOT and GOT, each with the meaning "possess," are analyzed with respect to differences among several ethnic dialects: American Anglo and Black English, British English, and Mexican-American and Puerto Rican English. Data from three sets of interviews which elicited these verbs are discussed. These and other published data are used to evaluate possible dialect grammars. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED108237

SWRL

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY
TECHNICAL NOTE

DATE: December 5, 1972

NO: TN-2-72-57

HAVE/GOT IN THE SPEECH OF CHILDREN

Robert Berdan

ABSTRACT

The syntactic and semantic constraints on the occurrence of HAVE-GOT and GOT, each with the meaning possess, are analyzed with respect to differences among several ethnic dialects: American Anglo and Black English, British English, and Mexican-American and Puerto Rican English. Data from three sets of interviews which elicited these verbs are discussed. These and other published data are used to evaluate possible dialect grammars.

CS202 134

This document is intended for internal staff distribution and use. Permission to reprint or quote from this working document, wholly or in part, should be obtained from SWRL, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720

HAVE/GOT IN THE SPEECH OF CHILDREN

Robert Berdan

Analysis of the verbal constructions used to show possession in English is complicated by the interaction of social and linguistic variation. The constructions considered in this paper employ HAVE and/or GOT.[1] Differences in their use are associated with ethnic and class dialects. These two words also appear in a range of non-possessive uses.[2] However, constructions which indicate possession in one dialect do not necessarily do so in another dialect.

The paper is divided into three sections. The first gives general information about the use of possessive verb constructions in the English of Anglo and Black Americans, and in the English of British speakers. Consideration is also given to the use of these constructions in Mexican-American English and Puerto Rican English. The second section of the paper discusses three sets of interviews which elicited possessive verb constructions in the speech of Los Angeles-area children. The third section discusses the implications of these data for the construction of transformational grammars.

---

[1]Capital letters indicate an abstract representation independent of inflection: HAVE includes the realizations has and have.

[2]The *Oxford English Dictionary* (1937) lists 27 different uses of HAVE and 34 of GET.

I. THE USE OF HAVE AND HAVE-GOT

The situation in Anglo (American) English

Most Anglo English speakers use either HAVE (1a) or the combined form HAVE-GOT (1b). Other speakers use both forms. Both sentences (1a)

1a. John has a salami sandwich.

b. John's got a salami sandwich.

and (1b) mean the same as (2):

2. John possesses a salami sandwich.

HAVE has a variety of uses which differ semantically and/or syntactically from (1a):

Tense auxiliary	3a.	John has eaten his sandwich.
With modals	b.	John should have put mustard on the sandwich.
Quasi-modal	c.	John has to eat his sandwich. [hæstu]
Causative	d.	John has Olaf make salami sandwiches.
Main Verb	e.	John had a good time at the party.
	f.	They have fine weather in Northern California.
	g.	John has a drink every night when he comes home.
	h.	John's wife is going to have a baby.
	i.	John has a headache.

Zwicky (1970) uses two criteria--susceptibility to contraction and tag question formation--to establish three classes of HAVE. The first class ($HAVE_1$) includes the tense auxiliary. It allows contraction (4a) and forms tag questions with HAVE (4b) rather than DO (4c).

4a. John's eaten his sandwich.

b. John's eaten his sandwich, hasn't he?

c. *John's eaten his sandwich, doesn't he?

The second class ($HAVE_2$) includes the main verb HAVE "in its central senses of possession, location, availability, and the like" (Zwicky, 1970, 329). $HAVE_2$ does not allow contraction[3] (5a) and forms tag questions with either $HAVE_2$ (5b) or DO (5c).

5a. *John's a salami sandwich.

b. John has a salami sandwich, hasn't he?

c. John has a salami sandwich, doesn't he"

The third class includes the main verb HAVE "in various restricted, idiomatic, or derived usages" (Ibid., 329) (3c-i). These do not allow contraction (6a) and form tag questions only with DO (6c).

6a. *John's a party every night.

b. *John has a party every night, hasn't he?

c. John has a party every night, doesn't he?

GOT also has nonpossessive uses. The GOT of (1b) is homonymous with the past tense form of get (7b).

7a. John gets a lot of mail.

b. John got a letter yesterday.

In this use GOT has the meaning obtain or receive, rather than possess. Some speakers also use got, rather than gotten, as the past participle of get.

8a. John has gotten a lot of mail this week.

b. John has got a lot of mail this week.

---

[3]In some environments $HAVE_2$ may be contracted by Americans, "I've no idea what you're talking about." This is more characteristic of British English.

For these speakers (8b) is acceptable. Although the verb is identical in form to (1b) the meaning is that of (8a), not (1a). In (8a,b) the verb has perfective meaning, but the verb of (1b) does not.

HAVE-GOT, like HAVE, may also be used as a quasi-modal:

9a. John has to go to phoenix.

b. John's got to go to Phoenix.

GOT is also used in some passive sentences in place of BE:

10a. John was fired again.

b. John got fired again.

It is considered more colloquial than BE, but there are also other syntactic and semantic differences (Bates, 1970).

GOT has the meaning possess, rather than obtain, only in the sequence HAVE-GOT. Neither the past auxiliary had nor any other auxiliary may be used and retain the meaning possess.

11a. *John had got the car yesterday.

b. *John will get the car yesterday.

c. *John will have got the car tomorrow.

Main verb $HAVE_2$ may be used in these tenses.

12a. John had the car yesterday.

b. John will have the car tomorrow.

There are other syntactic and semantic restrictions on HAVE-GOT that do not apply to $HAVE_2$. Rosenbaum (1967) shows that verbs may be categorized according to which complementizers they may dominate. The restrictions on HAVE-GOT are the complementizers by which it may be dominated. $HAVE_2$ may occur in any of the complement constructions of (13). HAVE-GOT may only be dominated by the that complementizer (14a).

13a. Richard pretends that he has an idea.

b. Richard pretends to have an idea

c. Richard discourages having ideas.

14a. Richard pretends that he has got an idea.

b. *Richard pretends to have got an idea.

c. *Richard discourages having got ideas.

The restrictions on the use of HAVE-GOT with the complementizers in (14b) and (14c) is not a general restriction on a sequence of auxiliary and main verb, even with auxiliary $HAVE_1$ and main verb get in the sense of obtain:

15a. Richard pretends to have gotten the idea.

b. Richard dislikes having gotten secret information.

A similar pattern occurs with modals and quasi-modals, Either $HAVE_1$ (16a) or $HAVE_2$ (16b) may follow modals, but HAVE-GOT (16c) does not:

16a. I expected that John would still have his old car.

b. I expected that John would have gotten his old car back.

c. *I expected that John would still have got his old car.

The above syntactic facts about the differences between the distribution of $HAVE_2$ and HAVE-GOT may be accounted for by one generalization: HAVE-GOT may occur in any context in which HAVE is subject to person-number agreement. This precludes any tense except simple present tense (11-12); the -ing complementizer of (14c) which requires the participle; the for-to complementizer of (14b) which requires the

uninflected infinitive; and the modals and quasi-modals, which also require the infinitive. The role of this generalization in the grammar will be discussed later.

There are also semantic restrictions on HAVE-GOT that do not apply to HAVE. The restrictions more or less parallel Zwicky's distinction between $HAVE_2$ and other uses of HAVE: sentences which cannot have HAVE tag questions cannot have HAVE-GOT.

17a. John always has a good time at parties, doesn't he?

b. *John always has a good time at parties, hasn't he?

c. *John always has got a good time at parties.

18a. John's wife has a baby every twelve months, doesn't she?

b. *John's wife has a baby every twelve months, hasn't she?

c. *John's wife has got a baby every twelve months.

19a. John always has a drink before he goes home, doesn't he?

b. *John always has a drink before he goes home, hasn't he.

c. *John always has got a drink before he goes home.

There are certain syntactic restrictions on the occurrences of $HAVE_2$ when it clearly has its central meaning possess. Some of these are the restrictions Lakoff (1966) claims to be diagnostic of stative verbs:

Psuedocleft

20a. *What John did was have to book.

Complement of verbs like persuade, force

20b. *I persuaded John to have the book.

Do-so Constructions.

20c. *John has the book and Mary does so too.

Progressives

20d. *John is having the book.

Imperatives

20e. *Have the book.

With a concrete, inanimate object like book, $HAVE_2$ clearly meets the syntactic tests of a stative verb. The paradigms (21-26), however, show that the acceptability of HAVE in these environments is conditioned by the rest of the sentence.

21a. *What John did was have a ruptured appendix.

b. *I persuaded John to have a ruptured appendix.

c. *John has a ruptured appendix and Mary did so too.

d. *John is having a ruptured appendix.

e. *Have a ruptured appendix

22a. *What Mary did was have a headache.

b. *I persuaded Mary to have a headache.

c. John had a headache and Mary did so too.

d. Mary is having a headache.

e. *Have a headache.

23a. *What Maine did was have good weather.

b. *I persuaded Maine to have good wether.

c. Maine had good weather and Vermont did so too.

d. Maine is having good weather.

e. *Have good weather.

24a. *What John did was have trouble finding it.

b. I persuaded John to have trouble finding it.

c. John had trouble finding it and Mary did so too.

d. John is having trouble finding it.

e. *Have trouble finding it.

25a. What John did was have breakfast.

b. I persuaded John to have brea fast.

c. John had breakfast and Mary did so too.

d. John is having breakfast.

e. Have breakfast

26a. What Mary did was have a baby.

b. John persuaded Mary to have a baby.

c. Mary had a baby and Sally did so too.

d. Mary is having a baby.

e. Have a baby.

There is probably a wide range of difference in the acceptability of some of the above sentences. What is clear, is that more of the sentences in (25-26) are acceptable than of those in (20-21). Having breakfast and having a baby are activities, not states; and the babies and breakfast are not possessed in the same sense as the books and appendixes of (20-21).

That HAVE-GOT does not occur in these five constructions results from several interacting restrictions. All except the do-so construction violate the restriction that HAVE-GOT may only occur in the present tense, in constructions which allow HAVE to be marked for number agreement. None of the do-so sentences (20-26) is good with HAVE-GOT:

27a. *John has got the book and Mary does so too.

b. *John has got a ruptured appendix and Mary does so too.

c. *Maine has got good weather and Vermont does so so too.

d. *John has got trouble finding it and Mary does so too.

e. *John has got breakfast and Mary does so too.

f. *Mary has got a baby and Sally does so too.

The sentences are not made more acceptable by changing the tense of do-so:

28a. *John has got the book and Mary has done so too.

b. *John has got a ruptured appendix and Mary has done so too.

There are other syntactic restrictions on $HAVE_2$ and HAVE-GOT. They do not occur in the passive except in certain idioms (30).

29a. *The books were had by John.

b. *The books have been got by John.

30. I've been had.

Neither $HAVE_2$ nor HAVE-GOT allows indirect object inversion, although it can occur with got in the sense obtain (Bates, 1970):

31a. I have a bear for Bill.

b. *I have Bill a bear.

32a. I've got a bear for Bill.

b. *I've got Bill a bear.

33a. I've gotten a bear for Bill.

b. I've gotten Bill a bear.

The sentences discussed so far have shown certain systematic similarities and differences among $HAVE_1$, $HAVE_2$, and HAVE-GOT. Sentences (34-48) compare these constructions in seven different surface structures. With the few exceptions discussed below, $HAVE_2$ functions as a main verb, rather than like auxiliary $HAVE_1$. The HAVE used in HAVE-GOT functions like auxiliary $HAVE_1$ rather than $HAVE_2$.

1. Questions. BE is preposed in questions whether it is used as a verb (34a) or as an auxiliary (34b). Auxiliary $HAVE_1$ (34d) may be preposed but not main verb $HAVE_2$ (34c). HAVE may be preposed in HAVE-GOT (34e).

34a. Is John the new vice president?

b. Is John running for vice president?

c. *Has John his instructions?

d. Has John received his instructions?

e. Has John got his instructions?

Like other main verbs, $HAVE_2$ forms questions with Do Support in American Anglo English.

35a. Does John like his instructions?

b. Does John have his instructions?

2. Auxiliary contraction. The same pattern is apparent with auxiliary contraction. BE may contract either as verb or auxiliary; HAVE may contract only as auxiliary.[4]

---

[4]For some speakers contraction of auxiliary has and have may be obligatory; for some others it may be obligatory only with got.

36a. John's the new vice president.

b. John's running for vice president

c. *John's his instructions.

d. John's received his instructions.

e. John's got his instructions.

3. Neg Contraction.

37a. John isn't the new vice president.

b. John isn't running for vice president.

c. *John hasn't his instructions.

d. John hasn't received his instructions.

e. Jonn hasn't got his instructions.

As with questions, Neg Contraction requires Do Support with main verb $HAVE_2$:

38a. John doesn't like the new vice president.

b. John doesn't have his instructions.

4. Auxiliary Shift. This rule is used by Baker (1971) to transpose the auxiliary and certain preverbs if the auxiliary is not stressed.

39a. John is already angry.

b. John is already running for vice president.

c. *John has already his instructions.

d. John has already received his instructions.

e. John has already got his instructions.

5. Auxiliary Attraction. Certain negative preverbs allow the auxiliary to be preposed (Fillmore, 1966).

40a. Only rarely is the bus on time.

b. Only rarely is anyone actually working.

c. *Only rarely <u>has</u> John his instructions.

d. Only rarely <u>has</u> John received all the instructions he needed.

e. Only rarely <u>has</u> John <u>got</u> all the instructions he needs.

In each of these five constructions $HAVE_2$ is unlike auxiliaries, but like other main verbs. HAVE-GOT appears to be a sequence of auxiliary and main verb. In the two following constructions HAVE has properties both of an auxiliary and of a main verb.

6. Tag Question.

41a. John has a new car, <u>hasn't</u> he?

b. John has a new car, <u>doesn't he</u>?

42a. John has got a new car, <u>hasn't</u> he?

b. John has got a new car, <u>doesn't</u> he?

Sentences (41a, 42b) follow the pattern of an auxiliary; (41b, 42b) follow the pattern of a main verb. However, if the main sentence is negated, only the auxiliary to which the negative is attached may occur in the tag question:

43a. *John <u>doesn't have</u> a new car, <u>has</u> he?

b. John <u>doesn't have</u> a new car, <u>does</u> he?

44a. John <u>hasn't got</u> a new car, <u>has</u> he?

b. *John <u>hasn't got</u> a new car, <u>does</u> he?

7. Conjunction reduction. Reduced conjoined sentences show a pattern similar to Tag Questions except that negative <u>hasn't got</u> may be replaced either by <u>has</u> (48a) or <u>does</u> (48b).

45a. John has a new car and so has Mary.

b. John has a new car and so does Mary.

46a. John has got a new car and so has Mary.

b. John has got a new car and so does Mary.

47a. *John doesn't have a new car and neither has Mary.

b. John doesn't have a new car and neither does Mary.

48a. John hasn't got a new car and neither has Mary.

b. John hasn't got a new car and neither does Mary.

The situation in British English

Current British usage of $HAVE_2$ and HAVE-GOT is not identical with current American usage. There are both syntactic and semantic differences.

The syntactic differences are most noticed with $HAVE_2$ in questions and with negation. Unlike American English, British English allows $HAVE_2$ to function either as an auxiliary (49) or as a main verb (50) in these two constructions:

49a. Has John his glasses?

b. John hasn't his glasses.

c. Hasn't John his glasses?

50a. Does John have his glasses?

b. John doesn't have his glasses.

c. Doesn't John have his glasses?

There is a semantic difference between the sentences of (49) and those of (50). The sentences of (49) are identical in meaning with those of (51):

51a. Has John got his glasses?

b. John hasn't got his glasses.

c. Hasn't John got his glasses?

The semantic distinction between (49) and (51) on the one hand and (50) on the other is shown by sentences such as (52) from Palmer (1968).

52. The shop hasn't any ice cream because it doesn't have ice cream.

For most Americans (52) explains nothing. For speakers of British English, however, (52) explains that the reason there is at present no ice cream in the store is that the store does not stock ice cream. For some American English speakers this reading may be obtained from (53) which substitutes HAVE-GOT for HAVE.

53. The shop hasn't got any ice cream because it doesn't have ice cream.

Palmer notes that the question inversion of (49a) is not possible in all contexts, particularily, past tense.

54a. *Had you a good time?

b. *Had the shop any ice cream?

The situation in Nonstandard Black English

The use of main verb $HAVE_2$ and HAVE-GOT in Black English has never been described in detail. However, certain aspects have been reported. Three major differences from standard Anglo usage are apparent:

1. There is no person-number inflection of HAVE: have replaces standard has

55a. They have a new car.

b. He have a new car.

2. HAVE is not used with GOT: NBE GOT is equivalent to AE HAVE-GOT.

56. He got long legs.

3. The auxiliary used with GOT in questions and negation is DO.

57a. Do he got long legs?

b. He don't got long legs.

Black English has been defined in terms of patterns of variation, not categorical usage of nonstandard constructions. Some persons who are independently judged to speak nonstandard Black English may also at some times use the constructions in (58) which are identical with those used by speakers of Anglo English.

58a. He has a new car.

b. He has got long legs.

c. Has he got long legs?

d. He hasn't got long legs.

Labov reports variation in the use of have/has for New York teenagers. He found that club members, Black teenagers belonging to street groups, used has about 20% of the time; Lames, Blacks who do not belong to the clubs, about 60% of the time, and Anglo teenagers always used has. Club members used nonstandard have much more than they used nonstandard agreement with other, regular verbs (Labov, et al., 1968).

The Labov study does not differentiate between have as main verb and have as tense auxiliary, stating that there is no syntactic conditioning on the uninflected use of have.

Another New York study (Wolfram, et al., 1971) found that Black English speakers used have in 75% of the third person, singular con-

texts. This absence of person/number inflection is again slightly more frequent than with regular verbs, but is based on a small number of instances.

Labov claims HAVE or GOT can be deleted as a main verb (Labov, et al., 1968, footnote 39, p. 354) as in (59):

59. ..the crowd I hang out with it Ø no leader.

His example, however, is not necessarily evidence for such a claim. Conceivably (59) is the nonstandard equivalent of (60a) rather than (60b).

60a. There isn't any leader.

b. It has no leader.

The usual nonstandard of (60a) replaces existential there with it, as in (61).

61. It isn't any leader.

Labov reports that occasionally the copula is deleted in existential sentences (p. 180), giving

62. It Ø always somebody tougher than you are.

The same rules that produce (62) will also produce his example of a deleted verb in (59).

Loflin (1970) describes Black English as having no auxiliary HAVE. His data are drawn largely from the speech of one fourteen-year old boy. Based on the assumption that there is no have auxiliary he develops a tense system for Black English different from the Standard English tense system.

If the have of have got is in fact identical to auxiliary have with other verbs, and if Loflin is correct that Black English has no auxiliary

HAVE, sentence (56) is explained: the absence of HAVE would follow from the general absence of HAVE as an auxiliary. However, as discussed previously, there are restrictions on HAVE with GOT that do not apply generally to HAVE as a tense auxiliary. Also, as both the New York studies show, auxiliary HAVE does occur in Black English.

Labov (Labov, et al., 1968) argues that the HAVE auxiliary is not absent from Black English, but subject to rules which delete its contracted forms, giving (64a, b) as alternates of (63a,b).

63a. They've gone home already.

b. He's gone home already.

64a. They gone home already.

b. He gone home already.

The same argument could be used to relate (56) to (65).

65. He's got long legs.

There are no discussions of GOT with DO auxiliary. Labov cites one example of DO replacing HAVE as tense auxiliary.

66. [160] Did you ever heard? (p. 227)

The data given in Henrie (1969) include on example of GOT with HAVE,

67. He haven't got a surprise.

one example of GOT with DO,

68. Did he got any ideas?

and one example with no auxiliary.

69. He GOT a surprise?

It is not clear whether (68) is possessive or has the meaning of obtain. Standard English not only does not allow the DO auxiliary with GOT, it does not allow GOT with past tense (11b).

Other Nonstandard Dialects

There is little published information on the use of HAVE and GOT in Mexican-American English. One source is the Natalicio & Williams (1971) report of evaluations of children's responses to the Gloria and David sentences. These include sentences such as (70, 71).

70. David has a toothbrush.

71. He has a shoe on his foot.

The evaluators, trained linguists, noted that the children used /hæv/, or /hæf/ in some instances, rather than /hæz/. Some of the children also used is have, however, there is no indication of how many of the children did this or if any of the children used one form to the exclusion of others. Of the evaluations published in their appendix, nonstandard has is mentioned for only two of ten children, compared with nine of ten Black children in the same study.

Some use has been made of the Dialect Differentiation Measure (Pfaff & Berdan, 1972) with Mexican-American children.[5] All but one child used have for has in some instances (Table 1), and the one exception used gots. For most of the children there was variation between

[5]The data reported here result from a 1972 study done by William Russell and the Dialect Characteristics Activity staff with Mexican-American children in East Los Angeles.

the use of standard and nonstandard forms in the affirmative. There was one instance of is have, that by Participant 10 who used no standard forms, but who corrected the is have to have (72).

72. This clown is have he have a hat.

The nonstandardness of the negative sentences results from nonstandard use of negation in most instances, not nonstandard HAVE. The following types of nonstandard negation occurred:

73 a. One don't have windows.

b. One not have windows.

c. One no have windows.

d. One have windows and one not.

e. One have no windows[6]

Only (73a) is typical of other nonstandard dialects. The others (73b-e) are examples of unattracted negation which occurs frequently in MAE in most negative contexts. There were only isolated instances of unattracted negation by Black children in the DDM (Praff & Berdan, 1972).

Another study of California Mexican-American children is reported in Castro-Gingras (1972). There is no quantification of nonstandard data in that report but three examples of nonstandard HAVE and GOT are given:

74 a. They don't got no wheel no more.

b. I have two mouse.

c. You no have crayons?

---

[6]The negation in (73e) is not, strictly speaking, nonstandard. However, it represents a style quite different from that children use in answering the DDM questions.

TABLE 1

Use of HAVE and GOt by Mexican-American Children

Participant	has	have	is have	gots	% Nst Affirm	doesn't (have)	doesn't got	don't got	Unatt Net	% Nst Neg
5	11	2	0	0	15	4	0	1	0	20
9	8	2	0	0	20	0	0	1	2	100
1	4	1	0	0	20	0	0	2	0	100
2	4	7	0	0	64	0	0	6	0	100
11	1	3	0	0	75	1	0	1	5	86
4	2	0	0	10	83	4	3	0	0	43
7	2	11	0	0	85	0	0	0	2	100
8	2	11	0	0	85	0	0	1	3	100
10	0	11	1	0	100	0	0	4	0	100
Mean					61					83

These examples show the use of uninflected have, the use of DO auxiliary with got, both also typical of Nonstandard Black English, and the use of unattracted negation, typical of Mexican-American English.

A major study of Puerto Rican English, Wolfram, Shiels & Fasold (1971), reports some evidence on the use of got by second-generation Puerto Rican teenagers in New York. Their data contain 13 sentences of got with negation; eight use don't (75) and five use ain't (76).

75. [65b] I don't got no time to play.

76. [64a] He ain't got no good education.

Wolfram, et al., cite these as evidence that got is a main verb. They also give a sentence with got marked for past tense. (77). This is mentioned only as an anological formation of past tense. However, if PRE makes got a main verb, it is not unreasonable that it should employ the productive form of the past tense.

77. [42b] I gotted a thirty-five.

II THREE STUDIES ON HAVE AND HAVE-GOT

Three studies have been done at SWRL which produced data on HAVE and HAVE-GOT. The first, (Legum, et al., 1971) studied Black children, eliciting data in naturalistic conversation. The second (Berdan, 1972a), studied the responses of Anglo children to convergent communication tasks. The third study (Berdan, 1972b; Pfaff & Berdan, 1972), used HAVE to differentiate between speakers of Nonstandard Black English and speakers of other dialects.

The Naturalistic Observational Study

The study reports data from twelve Black children ranging in age from kindergarten to third grade. Details regarding choice of informants and elicitation procedures are reported in Williams & Legum (1970). Linguistic realizations of a large set of constructions were coded into the text and processed with a concordance program (Pfaff, 1971). A tabulation and analysis of these coded constructions is given in Legum, et al., (1971).

Four parameters were considered in evaluating the use of HAVE: syntactic function, surface realization (have, /ə/, Ø, or got), conversational context, and age of informant. In the compilation of the code tables no distinction was made between present tense forms with have and past tense forms with had. Table 2 is a re-tabulation of Table 69 (Legum, et al., 1971, p. 96) listing only present tense forms and excluding forms used in songs.

TABLE 2

Realizations of present tense HAVE by Grammatical Categories

Syntactic function	Full form	/ə/	Ø	got
Main verb	35	0	0	45
Quasi-Modal	11	0	0	8
Modal+have	0	5	0	0
Auxiliary	4	0	2	0

Table 2 shows, as the table in the previous report did not, that variation in the realizations of HAVE is syntactically and lexically conditioned. HAVE is always reduced to /ə/ following a modal, but nowhere else do the reduced forms occur. There were only four instances of auxiliary $HAVE_1$. These occurred sentence final, with a contracted negative, and initially in a question; all environments that are not subject to contraction or deletion (Labov, et al., 1968). The only reported instances of deleted $HAVE_1$ are those where it preceded been. This is the only environment in which deleted HAVE does not result in ambiguity between AE present perfect and simple past tenses.

These data give strong support to the three statements made earlier about possessive HAVE in Black English.

1. There are no instances of has with a third singular subject; all seven of the possible instances use HAVE.[7]
2. There are 45 instances of got; none of them is preceded by either the full or reduced forms of have or has.
3. There was one instance of got used with negation (78) giving the environment for auxiliary do. There were also three questions.

78. (11405.0921) Because her don't got a husband.

79. (11405.0505) Sherry, you got a slip under your dress?

80. (06301.1718) Do you got your license?

---

[7]There is one instance of has with a first person, plural subject. This is characteristic of hypercorrection which Labov (Labov, et al., 1968) attributes to the non-native use of a rule.

There was also one question with a quasi-modal got which also had a preposed do auxiliary.

81. (11405.1022) Do you all got to go to church?

Considered as a group, the twelve children show only a slight preference for got over have as a main verb. There seems not to be any age-grading effect (Table 3).

TABLE 3

Use of Have and Got by Grade Level

Grade	Have	Got
Kindergarten	25	21
First Grade	2	11
Second Grade	2	9
Third Grade	4	6

Tabulation by individual, however, shows that most individuals have a definite tendency to use one form or the other (Table 4).

TABLE 4

Use of Have and Got by Individuals[8]

Participant	Have	Got	% Got
4-4-04	0	9	100
6-2-02	0	4	100
1-4-05	2	17	89
2-1-05	1	5	83
2-2-01	1	4	80
1-2-01	6	3	33
6-1-05	3	1	25
1-1-03	17	1	06

The Convergent Communication Study

Three pairs of Anglo children, one pair each from first, second and third grade, were given a series of convergent communication tasks. Performing the tasks involved describing pictures of objects and imaginary animals in such a way that they could be discriminated from a set of similiar objects. Procedures are documented in Berdan (1972b).

As with the Black children, the children in this study tended to use one form of the possessive construction or another.

[8] Table 4 includes only individuals with a total of four or more have and got.

TABLE 5

Use of HAVE, HAVE-GOT, and GOT by Anglo Children

Participant	HAVE	%	HAVE-GOT	%	GOT	%
2b	26	100	0	.11	0	
3b	25	.89	3	.11	0	
1b	30	.88	0		4	.12
2a	19	.83	2	.09	2	.09
1a	9	.39	1	.04	13	.56
3a	4	.13	23	.77	3	.10

In other respects the data from these Anglo children are very different from those reported with Black children in the naturalistic observational study.

1. All 88 instances of third singular HAVE which were subject to agreement were of the inflected form has.
2. HAVE-GOT did occur at least once in the speech of four children. The uncontracted form of the auxiliary was used only with negation (82); it was contracted in all environments where contraction was possible (83, 84).

    82. (2b-075) I haven't got a yellow one.

    83. (3b-109) I've got some.

    84. (3a-098) He's got long shoes.

3. There were seven instances of got with no auxiliary. Three were in quesions from which the subject was also deleted (85). When

    85. (3a-083) Got short shoes?

the subject is deleted from a question, the auxiliary must also be deleted to avoid the ungrammatical sequence (86). Sentences like (85) are not nonstandard in the same way that sentences like (86) are.

86. *Has got short shoes?

The other instances of got with no auxiliary are not third person, singular. That is, they are instances in which Standard English would employ have rather than has (87).

87. (1b-084) OK, you got the one that has one.

4. Got was used with do auxiliary 15 times: five times with negation (88) and ten times with questions (89).

88. (2a-058) I don't got no black one.

89. (1a-089) How many legs does he got.

The DDM Study

Twenty-eight Black children and nine Anglo children participated in two tryouts of the Dialect Differentiation Measure (Berdan, 1972b; Pfaff & Berdan, 1972). Among the tasks the children performed was one in which they responded to the question, "What's the difference between this [object] and this [object]?" referencing a picture of a pair of common objects such as boats or houses. When the objects differed by the number of some part (sails on the boats, windows in the houses), they were described by sentences using a possessive main verb.

90 a. (BL2) This boat have one sail and this boat has two sails.

b. (BL6) That one has two windows and that one has one.

c. (BL9) This house don't got no window; this house do.

1. There was one instance in which an Anglo child used have rather than has. Two-thirds of the Anglo children used has exclusively; for the rest of the Anglo children, has was the predominant form. Five of the Black children used only has; two used only have. Half of the rest of the Black children alternated between has and have, with have being the predominant form.
2. None of the children used HAVE-GOT. Four Black children used exclusively GOT with no HAVE auxiliary.
3. The data do not include questions, but with negation, DO is the only auxiliary used with GOT (90).
4. Four children used the form gots. One girl from an interracial home used no other form; she and the two Anglo children who used gots used doesn't got in the negative. The Black child who used gots once, used don't got in the negative.

III IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSFORMATION

Existing grammars do not provide even observational adequacy of the facts which have been presented about HAVE and particularly, HAVE GOT. As Bach (1967, 467) noted, "Under any analysis so far proposed, the special behavior of got and have must be taken care of in an ad hoc fashion. My analysis is no better or worse than others in this respect."

British English

The British English data given in Palmer (1968) seem best analyzed as two separate verbs: auxiliary $HAVE_1$ and main verb $HAVE_2$. The two are distinguished both syntactically and semantically. $HAVE_2$ is

inserted into the base like any other main verb. It is completely regular with respect to questions (91) and negation (92).

91a. Does John have a new car?

b. Does John want a new car?

92a. John doesn't have a new car.

b. John doesn't want a new car.

$HAVE_1$ has a somewhat different meaning and behaves syntactically like an auxiliary.[9]

93a. John has a new car.

b. John has seen a new car.

94a. Has John a new car?

b. Has John seen a new car?

95a. John hasn't a new car.

b. John hasn't seen a new car.

HAVE-GOT is identical in meaning with $HAVE_1$ and can be considered to result from optional insertion of GOT into a string containing $HAVE_1$. The Got-Insertion Transformation operates on any sequence which contains the sequence [Tense] Node, [Perfective], and either no [verb] or a lexically empty [verb] node. Proper ordering of the Got-Insertion will preclude got in strings in which Tense is deleted: imperatives, For-to and POSS-ing complementizers, and following modals and quasi-modals.

---

[9]Palmer does not state whether British English allows a contracted have: "They've a new car."

Since complementizers do not trigger the deletion of [Tense until the cycle above the S in which GOT would be inserted (96)

96a. I believe that $_{S}$[John has got a new car].

b. *I believe John to $_{S}$[John has got a new car].

the Got-Insertion Transformation must not apply until at least the last cycle. It must, however, precede the rule which attaches verbal affixes to the appropriate lexical items since that rule, which is also last cyclic (Stockwell, et al., 1968) would destroy the environment of the structural index.

AMERICAN ANGLO ENGLISH

The situation in American Anglo English is quite different from that in British English, and somewhat more complex. It is possible to describe most of the facts of Anglo English which have been discussed by using the grammar given for British English with only minor change. One way to account for the differences is to make the Got-Insertion rule obligatory. This correctly precludes (97a,b) but allows (98a,b) by Got-Insertion and (99a,b) from main verb HAVE.

97a. *Has John his glasses?

b. *John hasn't his glasses.

98a. Has John got his glasses?

b. John hasn't got his glasses.

99a. Does John have his glasses?

b. John doesn't have his glasses.

This analysis is somewhat unsatisfactory, or at least inelegant, given that there is no semantic distinction to support independent

sources for the verbs of (98) and (99), as there is in British English. A further difficulty is that this formulation of obligatory Got-Insertion would allow (100):

100. *Had John got his glasses?

Changing the structural index of the Got-Insertion rule from [Tense] to the feature [+Present] would correctly preclude (100) but would incorrectly allow (101):

101. *Had John his glasses?

A more desirable analysis would be one which reflects the lack of semantic difference between (97) and (98). Of the two possible sources for HAVE, main verb or auxiliary, main verb seems more desirable than auxiliary, given the restrictions of (34-48): in American Anglo English HAVE with possessive meaning clearly has more characteristics of a main verb than of an auxiliary.

One way to show this is to have the Got-Insertion rule operate optionally on a string containing [+ Present] and main verb HAVE. The rule would shift HAVE to the auxiliary and insert GOT. This avoids the problems of the previous formulation. There is one source of possessive HAVE and that is a main verb. GOT would not be inserted in (100) and DO Insertion would produce (102) instead of (101).

102. Did John have his glasses?

This rule is also somewhat inelegant in that it performs more than one operation, but it is clearly more desirable than the previous analysis. The rule is highly particular in that it applies to a single lexical item, but the facts of English show that GOT is highly idio-

syncratic. There is some precedent in the grammar for transformational insertion of semantically empty lexical items: There-Insertion and Do-Support. This analysis also provides an explanation for the fact that HAVE-GOT is not perfective: the Got-Insertion rule which copies HAVE into the auxiliary does not create a [Perfect] Node.

This analysis allows explanation of some, but not all, of the tag questions (103-104). If tag questions are derived through reduced either-or questions, the sentences of (103) may be explained as application of Got-Insertion to either the first, second, both or neither clauses:

103a. John's got big feet, hasn't he? (both)

b. John's got big feet, doesn't he? (first only)

c. John has big feet, hasn't he? (second only)

d. John has big feet, doesn't he? (neither)

The requirement of [+Present] for Got-Insertion explains why (103c) is acceptable, but (104a) is not: Got-Insertion could not apply to the

104a. John had big feet, hadn't he?

b. John had big feet, didn't he?

tag because of the past tense, resulting in (104b). However, this analysis does not explain why (105a) is acceptable, but (105b) is not:

105a. John doesn't have big feet, does he?

b. *John doesn't have big feet, has he?

Nonstandard Black English

The evidence in Black English suggests two distinct main verbs, HAVE and GOT. Each of them forms questions (107a,b) and negation (108a,b) with DO like any other main verb.

106a. John have a new car.

b. John got a new car.

c. John want a new car.

107a. Do John have a new car?

b. Do John got a new car?

c. Do John want a new car?

108a. John don't have a new car.

b. John don't got a new car.

c. John don't want a new car.

The non-occurrence of HAVE with GOT removes all motivation for a Got-Insertion rule in NBE. Optional lack of inflection for number agreement is part of the NBE verb system and HAVE and GOT require no special mechanism for this.

There is no evidence at present on whether NBE GOT is subject to the same restrictions that Anglo English HAVE-GOT is. This analysis would force any such restrictions into the lexicon. It remains to be determined if they can be handled there with facility.

Another possible analysis derives NBE GOT from AE HAVE-GOT by the general phonological rules which delete $HAVE_1$ in the contexts in which it may be contracted in AE. (Labov, et al, 1968). There is no explicit statement of this analysis in Labov, but it is implicit in his treatment of HAVE. Questions and negation would then be formed by DO Support, as with other main verbs (107c, 108c).

There are several problems with this treatment. Labov's rules do not delete the auxiliary in every syntactic environment. Only those

places in which the auxiliary is subject to contraction in AE, is it deleted in NBE. The auxiliary does not contract when it is preposed in questions (109), used with contracted negation (110) or when it occurs sentence final (111).

109a. Have they gone home yet?

b. *'ve they gone home yet?

110a. They haven't gone home yet

b. *They'ven't gone home yet.

111a. John hasn't gone home yet but Mary has.

b. *John hasn't gone home yet but Mary's.

These three enviroments represent the only instances of $HAVE_1$ in the data collected by Legum, et al, (1971):

112a. (06301.0501) Have you seen this picture?

b. (12201.0709) I haven't, I haven't.

c. (12105.0316) (Interviewer: Have you ever been to the zoo?) I have.

They are also precisely the environments in which HAVE must be deleted in order for DO Support to yield (90c, 107b, 108b).

To maintain the argument that BE GOT is related to AE HAVE-GOT it would be necessary to claim that with GOT, HAVE is always deleted. The generalization which motivated the original argument is lost, but even this weaker argument does not account for the facts.

Baker (1971) argues that Do Support must precede a rule which assigns emphatic stress for sentences like (113).

113a. John always has liked spaghetti.

b. John does like spaghetti.

Emphatic stress assignment, in turn, precedes Auxiliary shift, a rule which interchanges a preverb and the auxiliary only if the auxiliary does not have emphatic stress (114).

114a. John's always liked spaghetti.

b. *John has always liked spaghetti.

The rule which contracts auxiliaries must follow Auxiliary shift to derive (114a) from (115).

115. John has always like spaghetti.

Labov's rules for deletion of auxiliaries in NBE order deletion after contraction. This gives an ordering of rules as in (116).

116a. Do support

b. Emphatic stress assignment

c. Auxiliary shift

c. Auxiliary contraction

e. Auxiliary deletion.

This ordering of rules prevents the derivation of DO GOT from the deletion of HAVE since at the time Do Support applies HAVE has not yet been deleted.

Conclusions

These analyses suggest that, with respect to the use of HAVE and HAVE-GOT, the most desirable grammars for related dialects differ in non-minimal ways. The optimal grammar for each dialect is not necessarily that grammar that is most like grammars for other dialects. HAVE and HAVE-GOT are not simply variants of each other. Each is subject to a complex of semantic and syntactic constraints. These constraints are not the same for each dialect.

At present there seems to be relatively little study of social variation in the use of HAVE-GOT among Anglo English speakers. One of the most extensive is Crowell's (1955) analysis of GOT in American and British plays. However, it is not possible to determine if the playwrights describe actual usage, or reflect the prohibitions of pedagogues (Rice, 1932).

There is also a need for more data on GOT in minority dialects. Present data do not include critical environments for determining the restrictions on its occurrence. The entire study of HAVE-GOT needs to be placed in a perspective which includes other uses of HAVE, and of GOT, and especially HAVE-GOT as a quasi-modal.

REFERENCES

Bach, E. Have and Be in English syntax. *Language*. 43(2), 1967, pp. 462-485.

Baker, C. L. Stress level and auxiliary behavior in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 2(2), 1971, pp. 167-181.

Bates, R. R. A study in the acquisition of language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1970.

Berdan, R. The use of convergent communication for linguistic data collection. Technical Note No. TN 2-72-29, June, 1972a, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Berdan, R. Development of a dialect differentiation measure for Black English: a pilot study. Technical Note No. TN 2-72-36, Autust, 1972b, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Castro-Gingras, R. An analysis of the linguistic characteristic of the English found in a set of Mexican-American child data. Technical Note No. TN-2-72-26, June 13, 1972, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Crowell, T. L. Jr., A study of the verb get. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1955.

Fasold, R. W., & Wolfram, W. Some linguistic features of Negro dialect. In Fasold, R. W., & Shuy, R. *Teaching English in the inner city*. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970, pp. 41-86.

Fillmore, C. J. On the syntax of preverbs. Unpublished paper, Ohio State University, 1966.

Henrie, S. N. A study of verb phrases used by five year old nonstandard Negro English speaking children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

King, H. V. On blocking the rules for contraction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1(1), 1970, pp. 134-136.

Labov, W., Cohen, P., Robins, C., & Lewis, J. A study of the nonstandard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project 3288, Washington, D. C., Office of Education, Vol. 1, Section 3.9, 1968.

Lakoff, G. Stative adjectives and verbs in English. In Oettinger, A. G. Report No. NSF-17, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Computation Laboratory, 1966.

Legum, S., Pfaff, C. W., Tinnie, G., Nicholas, M., & Riley, W. The speech of young Black children in Los Angeles, TR 33, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Loflin, M. C. On the structure of the verb in a dialect of American Negro English. *Linguistics*, No. 59, 1970, pp. 14-28.

Natalicio, D. S., & Williams, F. Repetition as an oral language assessment technique. Center for Communication Research, University of Texas, Austin, 1971.

Palmer, F. R. A linguistic study of the English verb. Coral Gables, Fla: University of Miami Press, 1968.

Pfaff, C. W. A coding system for the study of linguistic variation in Black English, TR 38, 1971, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Pfaff, C. S., & Berdan, R. Development of a dialect differentiation measure for Black English: a study of Black and Anglo kindergarten children. Technical Note No. TN-2-72-47, October, 1972, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Rice, W. Get and Got. American Speech April 1932, pp. 280-296.

Rosenbaum, P. S. The grammar of English predicate complement constructions, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1967.

Stockwell, R. P., Schachter, P., & Partee, B. H. Intergration of trasformational theories on English syntax, UCLA Syntax project, Los Angeles, California, 1968.

Williams, C., & Legum, S. On recording samples of informal speech from elementary school children, TR 25, 1970, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California.

Wolfram, W., Shiels, M., & Fasold, R. W. Overlapping influence in the English of second generation Puerto Rican teenagers in Harlem, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971.

Zwicky, A. M. Auxiliary reduction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1(3), 1970, pp. 323-336.

DISTRIBUTION

5 - Directorate
5 - Design CRC Heads
3 - 209 Staff
10 - Library
1 - Linda Lester
20 - Author's Distribution